

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the indication that the drawings are acceptable, for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement by return of the Form PTO-1449, and for the acknowledgment of Applicant's Claim for Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document in the Official Action.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 2 and 3 contain allowable subject matter on page 5 of the Official Action.

Upon entry of the above amendments, the abstract and the specification will have been amended, and claims 1-3 will have been amended. Claims 1-3 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

On page 2 of the Official Action, the Abstract was objected to for minor informalities. Applicant notes that the Abstract has been amended to correct the issue indicated by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract.

On page 2 of the Official Action, the Specification was objected to for minor informalities. Applicant notes that the Specification has been amended to correct the issues indicated by the Examiner, as well as to correct other minor informalities.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

On page 3 of the Official Action, claim 1 was objected to for minor informalities. Applicant notes that the claims have been amended to correct the issues indicated by the Examiner, as well as to correct other minor informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 1.

On page 3 of the Official Action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant notes that the claims have been amended to correct the issues indicated by the Examiner, as well as to correct other minor informalities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

On pages 4 and 5 of the Official Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WERNIG (U.S. Patent No. 5,826,922) in view of KING (U.S. Patent No. 4,476,700) and LOUIS (U.S. Patent No. 722,162).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claim 1 is directed to *a system for operating a rod of a glove box*. However, Applicant submits that none of the applied references discloses *a system for operating a rod of a glove box*. In this regard, Applicant notes that the phrase “glove box” is not merely an intended use recited in the preamble of claim 1, but is instead clearly referenced throughout the body of the claim in defining the

structure of the claimed invention. For example, Applicant notes the following phrases in the claims: “installed at a front surface of a glove box” (claim 1, lines 2 and 3); “protrudes from one side surface of the glove box” (claim 1, line 9); “protrudes from another side surface of the glove box” (claim 1, line 14); “fixed to the glove box” (claim 1, lines 16 and 17; claim 3, line 2); and “protrude from the side surfaces of the glove box” (claim 1, line 18). Accordingly, since none of WERNIG, KING or LOUIS disclose *a system for operating a rod of a glove box*, Applicant submits that a combination of the teachings of these references could not possibly be characterized as rendering the subject matter of claim 1 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant further submits that WERNIG lacks any disclosure of *a knob installed at a front surface of a glove box*, as recited in claim 1. In this regard, Applicant notes that knob 4 in WERNIG is installed on a computer housing.

Applicant further submits that WERNIG lacks any disclosure of *a driving rod and a driven rod which protrude from side surfaces of a glove box*, as recited in claim 1. In this regard, Applicant notes that rods 15 and 16 in WERNIG are installed on a computer housing.

Applicant further submits that WERNIG lacks any disclosure of *a return member with an end fixed to a glove box*, as recited in claim 1. In this regard, Applicant notes that springs 501 and 521 in WERNIG are installed on a computer housing.

Applicant notes that WERNIG does appear to disclose a rotary gear 41 having pinion gears 44 and 45, and two rods 15 and 16 having respective rack gears 25 and 26 which are engaged with the respective pinion gears 44 and 45. However, as acknowledged by the Examiner, WERNIG lacks any disclosure a *driving rod having two separate rack gears*, and/or a *driven rotary gear* which is engaged with one of the two rack gears on such a driving rod, and/or a *driven rod having a gear rack engaged with such a driven rotary gear*.

Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such a dual rack driving rod, driven rotary gear and driven rod in the system of WERNIG based upon the teachings of KING. In this regard, Applicant initially submits that the sliding patio door bolt lock system of KING is nonanalogous to the computer housing latch system of WERNIG. Thus, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the disclosure of KING for motivation or teachings in modifying a system such as that of WERNIG.

Applicant further submits that the Examiner has not provided any proper reasoning regarding why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification to the system of WERNIG. In this regard, Applicant notes that the Examiner's motivational statement for the modification (i.e., "in order to move both rods") makes no sense, particularly since both of the rods 15 and 16 in WERNIG *are already moved* directly by the respective pinion gears 44 and 45. Accordingly, Applicant

P24622.A03

submits that the rejection contains no proper motivational statement for the suggested modification.

Applicant further submits that the suggested modification to the system of WERNIG (i.e., providing a dual rack driving rod, driven rotary gear and driven rod) would effectively destroy the teachings of WERNIG itself which includes rods 15 and 16 which are moved directly by the respective pinion gears 44 and 45 provided on a single rotary gear 41. In this regard, Applicant submits that the Examiner has provided no statement as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide for the *indirect* moving of one of the rods of WERNIG (i.e., through a dual rack driving rod and driven rotary gear) rather than the *direct* moving which is already provided (i.e., by the rotary gear 41 itself).

Applicant further submits that the modification suggested by the Examiner is clearly the result of impermissible hindsight reasoning, based upon the disclosure of the present application, rather than the teachings of the applied prior art. Accordingly, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such a dual rack driving rod, driven rotary gear and driven rod in the system of WERNIG based upon the teachings of KING.

Applicant notes that WERNIG also appears to disclose respective return springs 501 and 521 for the two rods 15 and 16. However, as acknowledged by the Examiner, WERNIG lacks any disclosure *a return member which provides returning force to a*

driven rod and a driving rod.

Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such a return member which provides returning force to both rods in the system of WERNIG based upon the teachings of LOUIS. In this regard, Applicant initially submits that the sash fastener system of LOUIS is nonanalogous to the computer housing latch system of WERNIG. Thus, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the disclosure of LOUIS for motivation or teachings in modifying a system such as that of WERNIG.

Applicant further submits that the Examiner has not provided any proper reasoning regarding why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification to the system of WERNIG. In this regard, Applicant notes that the Examiner's motivational statement for the modification (i.e., "in order to project the rods") makes no sense, particularly since both of the rods 15 and 16 in WERNIG *are already projected* by their respective springs 501 and 521. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection contains no proper motivational statement for the suggested modification.

Applicant further submits that the suggested modification to the system of WERNIG (i.e., providing a single common return member for both rods) would effectively destroy the teachings of WERNIG itself which includes separate springs 501 and 521 for the respective rods 15 and 16. In this regard, Applicant submits that the

P24622.A03

Examiner has provided no statement as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a single *common* return member rather than separate *individual* return members (i.e., springs 501 and 521) for the respective rods 15 and 16.

Applicant further submits that the modification suggested by the Examiner is clearly the result of impermissible hindsight reasoning, based upon the disclosure of the present application, rather than the teachings of the applied prior art. Accordingly, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such a return member which provides returning force to both rods in the system of WERNIG based upon the teachings of LOUIS.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper at least for each and certainly for all of the above-noted reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and an early indication of the allowance of all of the pending claims.

COMMENTS ON REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

In regard to the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2 and 3 on pages 5 and 6 of the Official Action, Applicant does not disagree with the Examiner's indication that none of the cited prior art shows or teaches a driving rotary gear with a stopper as recited in claim 2, or a guide plate with a hook as recited in claim 3. However, Applicant wishes to make clear that the claims in the present application recite a combination of features, and that the patentability of these claims is also based on the totality of the features recited therein, which define over the prior art. Thus the reasons for allowance should not be limited to those mentioned by the Examiner.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Entry and consideration of the present amendments, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so.

Any amendments to the claims that have been made in this amendment, which do not narrow the scope of the claims, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered cosmetic in nature, and to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Joung-hwan CHO



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Daniel B. Moon
Reg. No. 48,214

March 15, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191